DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 483 UD 019 550

TITLE	Special Report on Mandated Studies.
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[79]
NOTE	34p.; Not available in hard copy due to print quality of the original document; Several pages (legislation) may be marginally legible
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; Data Collection; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Needs; *National Surveys; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

This report reviews the effectiveness of national evaluation activities undertaken by the United States Office of Education, Office of Evaluation and Dissemination (OED) with regard to Title I compensatory education programs. Three major evaluations undertaken by the OED and technical assistance activities developed by the OED are described and discussed. It is generally concluded that national evaluations do not generate meaningful data or recommendations for the improvement of program effectiveness at the local level and that technical assistance activities are expensive alternatives to State agency evaluation activities. Alternatives to national evaluation studies and technical assistance activities are suggested. Emphasis is placed on the need of State and local programs to identify and focus on effective compensatory education practices to more fully meet the needs of educationally deprived children. Attachments to the report include legislative requirements of Title I program evaluations, an outline of OED evaluation activities and a listing of OED technical assistance centers and project directors. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JUN 2 6 1979

ED173483

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

SPECIAL REPORT

ON

MANDATED STUDIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NACEDC
425 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Suite 1012
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 724-0114

UD019550

TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 101. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in the following parts of this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

(20 U.S.C. 241a) Enacted April 11, 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title I, sec. 2, 79 Stat. 27; redesignated and amended January 2, 1968, P.L. 90-247, Title I, secs. 108(a) (2), 110, 81 Stat. 786, 787; amended April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, sec. 113(b) (2), 84 Stat. 126.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Sec. 148. (a) There shall be a National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "National Council") consisting of fifteen members appointed by the President, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointment in the competitive service, for terms of three years, except that (1) in the case of initial members, five shall be appointed for terms of one year each and five shall be appointed for terms of two years each, and (2) appointments to fill vacancies shall be only for such terms as remain unexpired. The National Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(b) The National Council shall review and evaluate the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, including the effectiveness of programs to meet their occupational and career needs, and make recommendations for the improvement of this title and its administration and operation. These recommendations shall take into consideration experience gained under this and other Federal educational programs for disadvantaged children and to the extent appropriate, experience under other public and private educational programs for disadvantaged children.

(c) The National Council shall make such reports of its activities, findings, and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title) as it may deem appropriate and shall make an annual report to the President and the Congress not later than March 31 of each calendar year. Such annual report shall include a report specifically on which of the various compensatory education programs funded in whole or in part under the provisions of this title, and of other public and private educational programs for educationally deprived children, hold the highest promise for raising the educational attainment of these educationally deprived children. The President is requested to transmit to the Congress such comments and recommendations as he may have with respect to such report.

(20 U.S.C. 2411) Enacted April 11, 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title I, sec. 2, 79 Stat. 34; amended Nov. 3, 1966, P.L. 89-750, Title I, sec. 115, 80 Stat. 1197; redesignated and amended Jan. 2, 1968, P.L. 90-247 Title I sec. 108(a) (4), 110, 114, 81 Stat. 786-788; amended and redesignated April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, Title I, secs. 112, 113(b) (4), 84 Stat. 125, 126.

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	National Evaluations	3
	Background	3
III.	Summary of Office of Evaluation and Dissemination Activities	5
	Study of Sustaining Effects of Compensatory Education	5
	Evaluation of Title I Programs in State Institutions for Neglected & Delinquent Children	6
	Evaluation of Title I Migrant Education Programs	6
	Study of Compensatory Reading Programs in Elementary Grades	6
	Council Comments on OED Evaluations	6
	Title I Technical Assistance Activities	7
	Development and Implementation of Title I State Evaluation Models	7
	Establishment of Title I Technical Assistance Centers	8
	Council's Comments on Technical Assistance	10
IV.	NACEDC Reactions and Recommendations to OED Activities	11
V.	Title I National Evaluations -- Practicality & Purpose	12
VI.	Conclusion	13
VII.	Footnotes	15

INTRODUCTION

How effective is ESEA, Title I? Each year, millions of federal dollars are allocated to address this issue. National studies and evaluations of several major aspects of the program have been undertaken. The only major aspect of the Title I program which has yet to be addressed is the effectiveness of those national studies.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (NACEDC), has examined with concern the major evaluation activities. Mandated by the Education Amendments of 1974, the Council has monitored the expenditure of $15 million by the National Institute of Education (NIE). Also, in response to this amendment, the Council has been reviewing the performance of the U.S. Office of Education, Office of Evaluation and Dissemination (OED), formerly the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, whose expenditures totaled approximately $11 million in fiscal year 1978. Of that figure, $7.5 million was specifically targeted for Title I.

The Council's overall conclusion is that this level of national evaluation is inappropriate. During a period of fiscal stringency and public uncertainty about the effective use of funds, it is important for policymakers to be more sensitive to the taxpayers' expectation from national evaluations -- clearly defined program improvement. While the Council endorses and supports educational research, it must protest the proliferation of studies and evaluations which never appear to affect programs or benefit children.

Therefore, the NACEDC recommends that the U.S. Congress declare a moratorium on any new USOE and NIE studies of compensatory education until such time as the results of current studies have been fully evaluated and reported to the U.S. Congress.

The Council expects the results of national studies or evaluations of compensatory education programs to be achievable recommendations which will increase the effectiveness of ESEA, Title I. The Congress and federal administrative agencies concerned with compensatory education need such recommendations to benefit from the evaluation expenditures.

Examinations of state and local programs must focus on current and alternative program practices. The most effective practices identified must be highlighted to provide clear understanding through examples of their impact. In the opinion of the Council, local program improvement is the desired result of evaluation expenditures. Such recommendations should be the specified goal of all data collection activities on Title I.

The Council considers the present approaches to Title I program evaluation nonproductive at the level of services to the child. Congress should stipulate that program improvement be the objective. Future national examinations must benefit the program consumer and eliminate wasteful efforts.

NATIONAL EVALUATIONS

BACKGROUND

Section 183, of ESEA, Title I, Education Amendments of 1978, outlines evaluation and technical assistance responsibilities of the Commissioner of Education.[1/] The Commissioner must provide independent evaluations to describe and measure Title I program impact. There must be developed and published standards for evaluation of program effectiveness and models for state educational agency evaluations. In addition, technical and other assistance should be provided as may be necessary to state educational agencies for systematic evaluations. The Commissioner must report to the respective committees of the Congress having jurisdiction over Title I, his progress in carrying out these responsibilities not later than January 31, of each calendar year. Results of these required evaluations, together with any other related findings and recommendations, must be reported to Congress.

Evaluation and technical assistance are delegated to the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination. Additional Evaluation responsibilities are designated, within the legislation, to be carried out by the NIE.[2/]

In its 1978, Special Report on NIE Study on Compensatory Education, the Council addressed the shortcomings of national evaluations.[3/] Few conclusions of how Title I can be improved resulted from this study. The study, itself, had not been designed to reach

firm conclusions on program effectiveness, or to propose recommendations for improvements.

The Council recommended in its report response to the NIE studies that:

> "The future thrust in the use of funds for research and development on a national level be in the area of technical assistance for the improvement of programs at the local school level."

Further, the Council's report states:

> "In the final analysis, what is basically most important is the improvement that takes place in the classroom. The educational climate pervading the school, the interaction involving principal, teacher, pupil and parent, and finally, the effective use of school and community resources contribute meaningfully in assisting pupils to overcome educational disadvantage and develop wholesome self-concepts."

In the opinion of the Council, the most effective measures to be undertaken included:

> "Onsite visits and the monitoring for compliance as well as auditing are essential in determining to what extent state and school districts are carrying out the intent of Congress in the passage of the ESEA, of 1965.
>
> "Federal and state program personnel and other outside resources such as college personnel, school personnel, including administrators and staff, be an integral part of evaluative activities. The formal consent of the districtwide ESEA, Title I parent councils be required for research projects or evaluations which propose to waive the requirements of ESEA, Title I."

The OED has increased its national evaluation activities. It has established Technical Assistance Centers, as a means of providing assistance to states in evaluating and reporting local

and statewide Title I programs. The Council examined these activities in the area of compensatory education and this report discusses their findings and recommendations.

SUMMARY OF OFFICE OF EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

The OED is currently undertaking three (3) major evaluations related to services provided under Title I; a report on compensatory reading was completed in 1975. It has also undertaken specific technical assistance activities designed to assist in the achievement of the national and state evaluation responsibilities detailed in the legislation. A chart of those activities related to ESEA, Title I, is presented in Attachment B, pages 22 to 26. Included are the contractors responsible for the data collection and the status of each study and activity. A brief description and Council comments are presented below.

Study of Sustaining Effects of Compensatory Education

A major longitudinal study of the sustaining effects of compensatory education is being conducted through 1980, under contract to the Systems Development Corporation. At a cost of $12 million, over four years, this study involves 326 schools, with 110,000 students in grades one through six. Student achievement data was collected, 15,000 surveyed, and two (2) interim reports prepared. This study is primarily designed to measure whether the gains made during compensatory education treatment are sustained over a period of time, and if so, for how long. Reading, mathematics, and language arts improvement are being studied.

Evaluation of Title I Programs in State Institutions for Neglected and Delinquent Children

The evaluation on Title I programs for neglected and delinquent children in state institutions cost $2.1 million for 2.8 years. It is designed to include site visits to 100 institutions in forty (40) states, to examine characteristics and operations of these programs. The study will also produce evaluation models and reporting procedures.

Evaluation of Title I Migrant Education Programs

A national evaluation of the Title I Migrant Education Program is assessing the overall impact of the program on student attitudes, personal development and achievement in reading and mathematics. The study will produce an evaluation handbook for the Migrant program to aid state and local educational agencies in evaluations and include formats for reporting results. The study will also validate the data in the Migrant Student Record Transfer System and is expected to be completed in the Spring of 1980. Its total cost is expected to be $3.3 million.

Study of Compensatory Reading Programs in Elementary Grades

A nationwide assessment of compensatory reading projects included the overall impact of programs, effective levels of different approaches. The cost of this study totaled $3,403,678, and was completed in July of 1976.

Council Comments on OED Evaluations

The Council has followed these evaluation efforts. Its members have participated in study review panels for the Sustaining Effects,

and Neglected and Delinquent studies. Seminars have been held with officials within OED to discuss their activities. Members of the Commission on Evaluation and Information Systems have been contacted for their opinions on the efforts undertaken. The Council concluded that these studies will result in few meaningful improvements. Basically, the Council judges that national evaluations do not generate meaningful data or recommendations for the improvement of program effectiveness at the local level.

Title I Technical Assistance Activities

Development and Implementation of Title I State Evaluation Models

Title I is the largest educational assistance program and has stimulated increased interest concerning its effectiveness in meeting the stated objectives. Other than national surveys and evaluations, the only other available source of evaluative information is annual state Title I reports. Section 172, of ESEA, Title I, states in part:

> "...that the state educational agency will make to the Commissioner (a) periodic reports...evaluating the effectiveness of payments under this title and of particular programs assisted under it in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children."

These reports are submitted to the Commissioner.

State reports have not been helpful in generating nationally representative data. Different types of information and different forms of presentation have hindered USOE's ability to aggregate

this data and to make comparisons of one state with another. States have utilized different evaluation procedures, reporting formats, data collection, and analysis techniques, and evaluation objectives.

In the ESEA Amendments of 1974, the Congress realized the Federal Government's inability to compile national data from such reports. The Commissioner of Education was mandated to undertake the development of uniform procedures for the evaluation of Title I Programs. Beginning in 1975, OED emphasized this area in an ongoing effort to develop, field test, and implement evaluation models. The annual cost of this effort has varied since its implementation, but is currently given the highest priority by the Department, and receives approximately $7.5 million annually. In addition to report models for elementary and secondary grades, others are being developed for early childhood education programs at a cost of $450,000. Studies on the effectiveness of the models and development of models to assess the noninstructional services of Title I programs are taking place. The elementary and secondary grade models are currently being voluntarily field tested in forty (40) states.

Establishment of Title I Technical Assistance Centers

The highest annual cost activity of OED is the establishment and maintanance of ten (10) Title I Evaluation Technical Assistance Centers. Their cost is $6.8 million for the periods of January 1978, to March 1979. Established in September 1976, under contract

to the USOE, the centers provide consulting services to state educational agencies, with emphasis on the Title I Evaluation Reporting System. These centers are regionalized to be made aware of the site-specific evaluation problems of each state.

The Technical Assistance Centers have negotiated letters of agreement with each department of education. These letters are general statements endorsing the centers and indicating a desire to take part in the services that are being made available. Each letter of agreement also clearly identifies the methods and procedures the centers will undertake in receiving and responding to requests for evaluation and reporting assistance within that state. The two primary functions of these centers are to: (1) be responsive to the expressed needs and desires of the agency or individual requesting assistance, and (2) provide enough information/training so that future dependency on the center will be minimized.

The number and level of educational personnel within a state receiving assistance varies greatly. Technical assistance may be limited to an audience including state educational agency and local educational agency administrators, computer specialists, school principals, teachers, and in some instances, parents. Specific protocol and contact agreements are made. The personnel working within each Technical Assistance Center are interviewed and USOE officials have the final decision on their employment.

Council's Comments on Technical Assistance

The essential purpose of the development of the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System is to assist the Commissioner of Education in gathering and aggregating data on student progress as evidence of program effectiveness. This collected data is intended to assist Congress in its judgments on Title I. The Council does not believe, however, that states should be forced (through regulations) to utilize USOE evaluation procedures if they can demonstrate an ability to generate an acceptable level of data utilizing their own procedures. In recent interviews which the Council has conducted with state evaluation officials, some expressed their opinion that evaluation models are of little practical value to them.

Since Technical Assistance Centers are to concentrate their activities on the national evaluation, they are a very expensive alternative to increased support of state agency evaluation activities. The Council firmly believes that the independence expressed in the law, for states to establish educational assistance programs to meet the needs of their educationally deprived children, should be expanded to include the area of program evaluation as well as program planning.

NACEDC REACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO OED ACTIVITIES

The U.S. Office of Education's statistics have estimated that no more than 66 percent of the children eligible for Title I services actually received services in 1977. To the disadvantaged children unserved at present, each dollar spent for national studies has no purpose.

The Council does not consider the establishment of technical assistance centers an effective use of federal funds. USOE's technical assistance capabilities are not enhanced through such facilities. Technical Assistance Centers are staffed by personnel who are not federal, state or local educational personnel. As temporary organizations, the level of evaluation expertise available from each center will be lost upon their dissolution. Their creation has presented an additional bureaucratic component to the Title I program.

The Council has consistently supported the expansion of funding for the Title I program to serve all eligible children. The $7.5 million expended by OED for ESEA, Title I evaluation activities could have provided services for thousands of those unserved. The Council believes that a larger than necessary percentage is diverted to federal and state evaluation efforts. THE NACEDC RECOMMENDS THAT USOE DISCONTINUE THE POLICY OF PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR PROGRAM EVALUATIONS THROUGH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS.

In conclusion, greater emphasis on the improvement of USOE's capabilities can result in more uniform and ongoing technical assistance. The Council recognizes the need for increased efficiency in federal administration. Inhouse evaluation personnel can work closely with many educational program areas, including Title I. This will increase the overall level of evaluation capability available to state and local educational agencies. The cost should be significantly less than the millions currently expended for consultant services in each region.

THE NACEDC RECOMMENDS THAT THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION UNDERTAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ORGANIZING AND IMPLEMENTING EFFECTIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CAPABILITIES WITHIN THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION.

TITLE I NATIONAL EVALUATIONS (PRACTICALITY & PURPOSE):

The Commissioner of Education is mandated to undertake national evaluations. Federal legislators have increased the scope of such activity and the budgeted allocations for their conduct. The Council has followed the National Institute of Education and the U.S. Office of Education in their evaluation efforts, and has concluded from these reviews that efficient national evaluations are inordinately expensive, and of questionable value. National evaluations which can direct effective policy changes are probably unobtainable.

Title I clearly indicates that each local educational agency is to implement those programs and projects that meet the unique needs

of their educationally disadvantaged. The Council has recommended that the "primary objective of the Title I programs be TO RAISE THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILD's LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT IN THE AREA OF THE BASIC SKILLS (READING, MATHEMATICS, AND LANGUAGE ARTS)," and this specification is currently included in the legislation. Each local educational agency maintains the flexibility to design services, either instructional or supportive, which they deem most necessary for basic skills improvement. Such services may include instruction in the areas of remedial reading, mathematics, language arts, English as a second language, general enrichment, special education/learning disabilities, music and art, dropout programs, social/cultural studies, science, and industrial arts. Auxiliary, supportive services have included resource centers, libraries, medical/dental, psychiatric and diagnostic, transportation, food, speech and hearing therapy, counseling student body activities, and clothing.[4/] The range of services and the subjective judgements of priority are far too numerous for national evaluations to accurately measure effectiveness.

THE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS THAT FUTURE LEGISLATIVE MANDATES FOR NATIONAL EVALUATION OF THE ESEA, TITLE I PROGRAM INCORPORATE SPECIFIC PURPOSES FOR THE UTILIZATION OF THE INFORMATION COLLECTED.

Conclusion

The intent of legislative mandates to undertake evaluations of Title I is to provide information to Congress and educational officials. It is claimed that this information can be utilized by

policymakers to modify aspects of the program and more fully meet the special educational needs of the children. The Council does not believe that the money expended for such evaluation efforts will produce sufficient data for judgments on the local effectiveness of Title I programs. Local district characteristics such as available resources, school design and management, student achievement and background, and state supportive services are primary factors that must be considered for program improvements.

An ongoing policy of the Council has been onsite observations of local programs. Urban, rural and suburban areas have been visited and reported in the Council's annual and special reports. Emphasis has been placed on the individual program practices implemented to raise achievement levels of educationally deprived children.

Identification of effective practices provide practical leadership to other school districts seeking program improvement. Large expenditures and excessive national evaluations are not necessary -- only dissemination. Each state and local education agency can benefit from an increased awareness of what is working. The Council recommends that this type of practice be undertaken by USOE.

THE NACEDC RECOMMENDS THAT THE COMMISSIONER IMPROVE THE NATIONAL DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION CONCERNING EFFECTIVE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM PRACTICES TO ALL STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AND TO THE EDUCATION PROFESSION AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

FOOTNOTES FOR MANDATED STUDIES REPORT

1/ Attachment A, full text of ESEA, Title I, Section 183, Page 17.

2/ Attachment A, full text of ESEA, Title I, Section 151, Page 17 and Section 821, Page 20.

3/ NACEDC Special Report on NIE Study on Compensatory Education; 1978.

4/ NIE Interim Report "Compensatory Education Services," July 31, 1977; Pages 20 and 55.

ATTACHMENT A

FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR EVALUATION OF ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

PROGRAM EVALUATION

SEC. 151. (a) The Commissioner shall provide for independent evaluations which describe and measure the impact of programs and projects assisted under this title. Such evaluations may be provided by contract or other arrangements, and all such evaluations shall be made by competent and independent persons, and shall include, whenever possible, opinions obtained from program or project participants about the strengths and weaknesses of such programs or projects.

(b) The Commissioner shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program or project effectiveness in achieving with objectives of this title.

(c) The Commissioner shall, where appropriate, consult with State agencies in order to provide for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies of programs and projects assisted under this title within a State.

(d) The Commissioner shall provide to State educational agencies, models for evaluations of all programs conducted under this title, for their use in carrying out their functions under section 143(a), which shall include uniform procedures and criteria to be utilized by local educational agencies, as well as by the State agency in the evaluation of such programs.

(e) The Commissioner shall provide such technical and other assistance as may be necessary to State educational agencies to enable them to assist local educational agencies in the development and application of a systematic evaluation of programs in accordance with the models developed by the Commissioner.

(f) The models developed by the Commissioner shall specify objective criteria which shall be utilized in the evaluation of all programs and shall outline techniques (such as longitudinal studies of children involved in such programs) and methodology (such as the use of tests which yield comparable results) for producing data which are comparable on a statewide and nationwide basis.

(g) The Commissioner shall make a report to the respective committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over programs authorized by this title and the respective Committees on Appropriations concerning his progress in carrying out this section not later than January 31, 1975, and thereafter he shall report to such committees no later than January 31 of each calendar year the results of the evaluations of programs and projects required under this section which shall be comprehensive and detailed, as up-to-date as possible, and based to the maximum extent possible on objective measurements, together with any other related findings and evaluations, and his recommendations with respect to legislation.

(h) The Commissioner shall also develop a system for the gathering and dissemination of results of evaluations and for the identification of exemplary programs and projects, or of particularly effective elements of programs and projects, and for the dissemination of information concerning such programs and projects or such elements thereof to State and local educational agencies responsible for the design and conduct of programs and projects under this title, and to the education profession and the general public.

(i) The Commissioner is authorized, out of funds appropriated to carry out this title in any fiscal year, to expend such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, but not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the amount appropriated for such program, of which $5,000,000 for each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1977, shall be available only for the surveys and studies authorized by section 821 of the Education Amendments of 1974.

(20 U.S.C. 241o) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 101, 88 Stat. 499, 500:

"PROGRAM EVALUATION

"SEC. 183. (a) INDEPENDENT EVALUATIONS.—The Commissioner shall provide for independent evaluations which describe and measure the impact of programs and projects assisted under this title. Such evaluations may be provided by contract or other arrangements, and all such evaluations shall be made by competent and independent persons, and shall include, whenever possible, opinions obtained from program or project participants about the strengths and weaknesses of such programs and projects. 20 USC 2833.

"(b) EVALUATION STANDARDS AND SCHEDULE.—The Commissioner shall (1) develop and publish standards for evaluation of program or project effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title, and (2) develop, in consultation with State educational agencies and representatives of local educational agencies, a schedule for conducting evaluations under section 124(g) designed to ensure that evaluations are conducted in representative samples of the local educational agencies in any State each year. Such standards will be developed only after widespread consultation and hearings with practicing State and local agency evaluators, and the Commissioner's standards will reflect the input of these groups. Standards, publication. Consultation and hearings.

"(c) JOINTLY SPONSORED STUDIES.—The Commissioner shall consult with State and local educational agencies in order to provide for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies of programs and projects assisted under this title within a State.

"(d) EVALUATION MODELS.—The Commissioner shall provide to State educational agencies, models for evaluations of all programs conducted under this title, for their use in carrying out their functions under section 172, which shall include uniform procedures and criteria to be utilized by local educational agencies and State agencies as well as by the State educational agency in the evaluation of such programs. In developing evaluation design models the Commissioner shall consult with State and local evaluators experienced in conducting such evaluations.

"(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Commissioner shall provide such technical and other assistance as may be necessary to State educational agencies to enable them to assist local educational agencies and State agencies in the development and application of a systematic evaluation of programs in accordance with the models developed by the Commissioner.

"(f) SPECIFICATION OF OBJECTIVE CRITERIA.—The models developed by the Commissioner shall specify objective criteria which shall be utilized in the evaluation of all programs and shall outline techniques (such as longitudinal studies of children involved in such programs) and methodology (such as the use of tests which yield comparable results) for producing data which are comparable on a statewide and nationwide basis.

"(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Commissioner shall make a report to the respective committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over programs authorized by this title and the respective Committees on Appropriations no later than February 1, 1980, 1982, and 1984 concerning the results of evaluations of programs and projects required under this section, which shall be comprehensive and detailed, as up-to-date as possible, and based to the maximum extent possible on objective measurements, together with other related find-

ings and evaluations and his recommendations with respect to legislation.

"(h) INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.—The Commissioner shall also develop a system for the gathering and dissemination of the results of evaluations and for the identification of exemplary programs and projects, or of particularly effective elements of programs and projects, and for the dissemination of information concerning such programs and projects or such elements thereof to State agencies and local educational agencies responsible for the design and conduct of programs and projects under this title, and to the education profession and the general public.

"(i) MAXIMUM EXPENDITURES.—The Commissioner is authorized, out of funds appropriated to carry out this title in any fiscal year, to expend such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, but not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the amount appropriated for such programs. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Commissioner shall place priority on assisting States, local educational agencies, and State agencies to conduct evaluations and shall, only as funds are available after fulfilling that purpose, seek to conduct any national evaluations of the program.

Part B—Educational Studies and Surveys

Study of Purposes and Effectiveness of Compensatory Education Programs

Sec. 821. (a) In addition to the other authorities, responsibilities and duties conferred upon the National Institute of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Institute") by section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act and notwithstanding the second sentence of subsection (b) (1) of such section 405, the Institute shall undertake a thorough evaluation and study of compensatory education programs, including such programs conducted by States and such programs conducted under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Such study shall include—

(1) an examination of the fundamental purposes of such programs, and the effectiveness of such program in attaining such purposes;

(2) an analysis of means to identify accurately the children who have the greatest need for such programs, in keeping with the fundamental purposes thereof;

(3) an analysis of the effectiveness of methods and procedures for meeting the educational needs of children, including the use of individualized written educational plans for children, and programs for training the teachers of children;

(4) an exploration of alternative methods, including the use of procedures to assess educational disadvantage, for distributing funds under such programs to States, to State educational agencies, and to local educational agencies in an equitable and efficient manner, which will accurately reflect current conditions and insure that such funds reach the areas of greatest current need and are effectively used for such areas;

(5) not more than 20 experimental programs, which shall be reasonably geographically representative, to be administered by the Institute, in cases where the Institute determines that such experimental programs are necessary to carry out the purposes of clauses (1) through (4), and the Commissioner of Education is authorized, notwithstanding any provision of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, at the request of the Institute, to approve the use of grants which educational agencies are eligible to receive under such title I (in cases where the agency eligible for such grant agrees to such use) in order to carry out such experimental programs; and

(6) findings and recommendations, including recommendations for changes in such title I or for new legislation, with respect to the matters studied under clauses (1) through (5).

(b) The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children shall advise the Institute with respect to the design and execution of such study. The Commissioner of Education shall obtain and transmit to the Institute such information as it shall request with respect to programs carried on under title I of the Act.

(c) The Institute shall make an interim report to the President and to the Congress not later than December 31, 1976, and shall make a final report thereto no later than nine months after the date of sub-

mission of such interim report, on the result of its study conducted under this section. Any other provision of law, rule, or regulation to the contrary notwithstanding, such reports shall not be submitted to any review outside of the Institute before their transmittal to the Congress, but the President and the Commissioner of Education may make to the Congress such recommendations with respect to the contents of the reports as each may deem appropriate.

(d) Sums made available pursuant to section 151(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be available to carry out the provisions of this section.

(e)(1) The Institute shall submit to the Congress, within one hundred and twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a plan for its study to be conducted under this section. The Institute shall have such plan delivered to both Houses on the same day and to each House while it is in session. The Institute shall not commence such study until the first day after the close of the first period of thirty calendar days of continuous session of Congress after the date of the delivery of such plan to the Congress.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

(A) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die; and

(B) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the thirty-day period.

(20 U.S.C. 1221e note) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 821, 88 Stat. 599, 600.

ATTACHMENT B

SUMMARY OF ESEA TITLE I AND OTHER ACTIVITIES OF USOE's OFFICE OF PLANNING, BUDGETING AND EVALUATION

OED EVALUATION ACTIVITIES RELATING TO ESEA TITLE I

ACTIVITY	MANDATE	CONTRACTOR	PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE	ESTIMATED COST	CURRENT STATUS
Evaluation of ESEA Title I Programs in State Institutions for Neglected & Delinquent Children	yes	Systems Development Corp., CA.	2/76 to 9/79	$2.1 million	Two phases are complete and reports disseminated. Successful practices report due in Fall of '79.
Study of Sustaining Effects Programs in Elementary Grades	yes	Systems Development Corp., CA.	6/75 to 12/80	$12 million	Seven reports have been completed.
Study of Compensatory Reading Programs in Elementary Grades	no	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.	6/71 to 7/76	$3.5 million	All reports and summaries have been produced and disseminated.
Evaluation of Migrant Education Program	yes	Research Triangle Inst., N.C.	2/76 to 5/80	$3.3 million	Design phase and first testing completed; second testing near complete. Two reports.
Development of Evaluation Models for Early Childhood Programs	yes	Huron Inst., Cambridge, Mass.	9/77 to 2/80	$450,000	Three draft reports to be finalized and disseminated in near future. Evaluation & reporting systems to commence 3/79.
Development and Implementation of Evaluation Models for Regular LEA Grant Program	yes	RMC Research & OED (in-house)	6/74 to 12/77	$900,000 & $30,000 annual.	Models are developed and in use. Four contractor reports to Congress. Results disseminated to SEA and LEA. Regulations being developed.
Development of Models to Assess non-Instructional Services	yes	RMC Research Corp. Bethesda, MD.	5/76 to 6/77	$376,426	Contract was terminated for the convenience of the government.

OED EVALUATION ACTIVITIES RELATING TO ESEA TITLE I

ACTIVITY	MANDATE	CONTRACTOR	PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE	ESTIMATED COST	CURRENT STATUS
Further Documentation of Title I Reporting Models for States	yes	RMC Research Corp., CA.	6/75 to 1/78	$650,000	Completed. Reports and Information disseminated and used for implementing SEA standardized evaluation reports & development of regulations.
Title I Evaluation Workshops for SEAs	yes	RMC Research Corp., CA.	6/76 to 12/77	$400,000	Workshops have been held. Materials have been reprinted and are being widely disseminated.
State Refinements to the USOE Title I Evaluation and Reporting System for ESEA Title I	yes	14 SEAs	12/78 to present	$408,356	Ongoing contracts with quarterly reports, with final reports to detail results and recommendations.
Technical Assistance Centers for Title I Evaluation	yes	10 separate contracts to research service firms.	10/76 to 9/79	$7 million per year	TACs are now working with every SEA. 55-60% of LEAs with Title I will attempt to implement in '78 - 79 school year.

USOE -- Title I

Technical Assistance Centers

Regions	Budgeted Funds Jan. 1978-March. 1979	Estimated Additional Funds needed to complete contract period-- thru Mar. 1979
1	1,028,083	-0-
2	306,480	-0-
3	1,132,000	440,000
4	175,747	40,000
5	400,308	142,000
6	492,153	64,000
7	452,998	40,000
8	399,176	117,000
9	485,334	27,000
10	349,376	110,000
	5,821,655	980,000

TITLE I EVALUATION
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS
PROJECT DIRECTORS

Region I

Dr. Everett W. Barnes, Jr.
RMC Research Corporation
111 Bow Street
Portsmouth, New Hampshire 03801
(603) 436-5385

Region II

Dr. Gary J. Echternacht
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
(609) 921-9000 x2566

Region III

Dr. Joan Troy
NTS Research Corp.
2634 Chapel Hill Blvd.
Durham, N.C. 27707
(919) 493-3451

Region IV

Dr. George Temp
Educational Testing Service
Southern Regional Office
3445 Peachtree Rd., N.E.
Atlanta, Ga. 30326
(404) 262-7637

Region V

Dr. Theodore Storlie
Educational Testing Service
Midwest Regional Office
1 American Plaza
Evanston, Ill. 60201
(312) 869-7700

Region VI

Dr. George Powell
Resource Development Inst., Inc.
314 Highland Mall Blvd.
Suite 450
Austin, Texas 78757
(512) 454-5281

Region VII

Dr. Carmen Finley
American Inst. for Research
P.O. Box 1113
Palo Alto, Cal. 94302
(415) 494-0224

Region VIII, IX, X

Dr. Joe Hansen
Northwest Regional Educational Lab.
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 248-6853

NACEDC OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES 1978-79

Owen F. Peagler, Chairman
Carol Schwartz, Vice Chairman
Wilbur H. Lewis, Vice Chairman

Urban Education Committee

Sarah M. Greene, Chairman
John Leopold
Carol Schwartz
George Willeford
M. Alan Woods

Migrant Education Committee

Ben Reifel, Chairman
Mary Anne Clugston
John Calhoun
Rosella Lipson
Wilbur H. Lewis

Mandated Studies Committee

Dorothy Fleegler, Chairman
J. Alan Davitt
Rosella Lipson
M. Alan Woods

Title I Eligible Nonpublic Students

J. Alan Davitt, Chairman
Sarah M. Greene
Wilbur H. Lewis

Executive Committee

Owen F. Peagler, Chairman
Carol Schwartz, Vice Chairman
Wilbur H. Lewis, Vice Chairman
Dorothy Fleegler
Sarah M. Greene
Ben Reifel

NACEDC Staff

Roberta Lovenheim, Executive Director
Gloria Strickland, Assistant Executive Director
Paul Keller, Senior Program Analyst
Marcia Wilson, Program Analyst
Lisa Haywood, Secretary

Consultants to the Council

Dr. Irving Ratchick
161 Brevator Street
Albany, New York 12206

Mrs. Jody Ward Starr
300 E. 40th Street
New York, New York 10016

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1979-626-738/1664

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Rosella Lipson
President
Preschool Mobile Foundation, Ir
802 North Sierra Drive
Beverly Hills, California 9 210
Term expires 9/15/77

Mary Anne (McCabe) Clug
Guidance Counselor
Hogback Trading Post
Waterflow, New Mexico 87421
Term expires 9/15/77

Ben Reifel
Retired Member of Congress
2505 South Kiwanis
Apartment No. 307
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57105
Term expires 9/15/77

Carol L. Schwartz (Vice Chairman)
Vice President
D.C. Board of Education
Suite 1205
415 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Term expires 9/15/77

George Willeford, M.D.
Child Psychiatrist
720 W. 34th Street
Austin, Texas 78703
Term expires 9/15/77

J. Alan Davitt
Executive Secretary
New York State Council of Catholic
School Superintendents
11 North Pearl Street
Albany, New York 12207
Term expires 9/15/78

Dorothy Fleegler
Executive Committee
Center for Children and Youth
in the State of Florida
Box 5497
Boca Raton, Florida 33432
Term expires 9/15/

Sarah Moore Greene
Vice Chairman
Knoxville Board of Education
701 E. Vine Street
Knoxville, Tennessee 37915
Term expires 9/15/78

Wilbur H. Lewis (Vice Chairman)
7552 E. Knollwood Circle
Tucson, Arizona 87515
Term expires 9/15/78

Owen F. Peagler (Chairman)
Dean
School of Continuing Education
Eastern Connecticut State College
Willimantic, Connecticut 06226
Term expires 9/15/78

John Leopold
Apartment #908
700 Richards Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Term expires 9/15/79

John Calhoun
Educator and Businessman
2816 Hewitt Avenue
Wheaton, Maryland 20906
Term expires 9/15/79

M. Alan Woods
106 S. Lee Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Term expires 9/15/79